

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 have been examined and claims 1 and 4 are amended herein.

Accordingly, claims 1-6 are now pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of all outstanding rejections and objections are requested.

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that method is practiced by a processor executing computer program code. The DOM of a web page is modified to produce a useful, tangible result. When the modified DOM is rendered a graphical representation of statistical data is overlaid on the web page. Claims 4-6 recite computer readable program code physically embodied in a computer usable medium and also recite the same useful, tangible result as claim 1.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The language objected to by the examiner has been deleted.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barg et al.

Claim 1 recites a method for displaying statistics pulled from a web page comprising parsing the dynamic object model (DOM) of the Web page to dynamically determine which objects have statistics available, determining the location and type of an element which is an object having statistics available, constructing a graphic object based on the available statistics, and modifying the DOM so that a combined view of the web page overlaid with the graphic object in close proximity to the element is displayed when the DOM is rendered.

Barg discloses interactive web site activity data visualization system and methods that allow a user to dynamically interact with various graphical data displays generated from parsed web site activity logs. Paragraph [0017].

SD-Graph depicts a sophisticated bar graphing system that allows creation and display of colorful bar charts with detailed statistics.

The Robertson article depicts graphs showing overall usage of a web site.

The examiner states that Barg does not teach overlay expressly, but does suggest it because Barg does teach interactive graphical user interface screen and having

windows or graphical users interfaces overlap one another on a computer screen was know in the art.

It is also stated that it would have been obvious to modify Barg to include overlaying window on the web page with the motivation to build a graphical web statistics display that is easy to read (see James Robertson article and report on SD Graph).

This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The establishment of a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP §2143.03

None of the cited references teach or suggest the claimed step of modifying the DOM of Web page so that graphical object, representing statistics available for an element, is displayed in close proximity to the element when the DOM is rendered.

Barg teachings relating to overlapping windows or graphical user interfaces does not teach or suggest the claimed element. SD-Graph and Robertson generally relate to graphical techniques do not teach or suggest the claimed combination.

Claim 8 is a method claim having similar limitations as recited in claim 1 and is therefore allowable for the same reasons. Claims 2-3 and 5-6 are dependent claims which are allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims and further allowable due to additional limitations recited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (925) 944-3320.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles E. Krueger
Reg. No. 30,077

LAW OFFICE OF CHARLES E. KRUEGER
P.O.Box 5607
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Tel: (925) 944-3320 / Fax: (925) 944-3363